# EXHIBIT A

## MEMORANDUM OF PRINCIPLE

Now comes Charles C., Miller, Petitioner and Plaintiff, who is a citizen of the state of Wyoming by birth, one of the several states of the Union, party to the Constitution of the United States of America. By the Constitutions of the State of Wyoming, Oregon, and Washington, the Constitution of the United States of America is the Law of the land.

Charles C., Miller presents this brief as the foundation of authority delegated by the Federal Constitution and is to be deemed evidence by affidavit sworn true, correct, certain, and materially complete to the best of my belief and current knowledge, under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the United States of America, so help me Almighty God.

### STATUS

> The status of an individual used as a legal term, means the legal position of the individual in or with regard to the rest of the community. L. R. 4 P.D. 11. The rights, duties, capacities and incapacitates which determine a person to a given class, constitutes his status; Campb. Austin 137. ... The action of assumpsit must be reckoned a technical instrument which gave no small help to the forces which were making for the transition from status to contract; 3 Holdsw. Hist. E. L. 349. Bouvier's Volume 3, page 3129.

### MAJOR PREMISE

NATURE'S GOD created mankind, mankind created constitutions, constitutions created governments, governments created rules, codes, regulations, and/or statutes (hereinafter called enactments), most of which are nefariously executed and applied as some government - sponsored court - crime - revenue raising - activity.

The presumption that the PEOPLE are subject to government jurisdiction by way of government enactments, presumes that THE PEOPLE are subject to those jurisdictions created by the constitutions, which in-turn created such governments in a self-perpetuating fashion.

' The Colonists' intent not to create a SOVEREIGN but rather, to further bind the branches of government is made clear in the preamble to the Bill of Rights, December 15, 1791.

"The conventions of a number of the States having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, IN ORDER TO PREVENT MISCONSTRUCTION OR ABUSE OF ITS POWERS, THAT FURTHER DECLARATORY AND RESTRICTIVE CLAUSES SHOULD BE ADDED: And as extending the Government, will best insure the beneficent ends of its institution."

The unlawful presumption that the colonists intended to establish a SOVEREIGN, by their Constitutional Charter, thereafter conferring upon such SOVEREIGN certain jurisdiction over the colonists themselves, is properly debunked by: Article I., Section 9, clause 8

"No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: --"

and Article I., Section 10, Clause 1

"No State shall ... grant any Title of Nobility."

Any jurisdiction emanating from a presumption of a fiction is presumptive or fictitious, and Such is a Factitious Tool For Unlawful Control.

Government sovereignty over THE PEOPLE is a presumption and a fiction, and which when once repudiated, must thereafter be proved to exist.

If the individual cannot be proved to be subject to the jurisdiction of any constitution or other social contract or compact, he also cannot be proved to be subject to the jurisdiction of any branch of government created thereunder.

Likewise, if it cannot be proved that the individual is DIRECTLY subject to the jurisdiction of any legislature, it also cannot be proved that he is INDIRECTLY subject to such jurisdiction by way of any Legislative Enactments.

In the absence of proof that the individual is subject to the jurisdiction of any constitution or other social contract or compact, jurisdiction over him DOES NOT EXIST.

**ARGUMENT - SUMMARY**

The general requirement that "... the burden is on the defendant to show the nonexistence of jurisdictional facts; Russell v. Butler, (Tex.Civ App.) 47 S.W.406; Gilchrist v. Oil Land Co., 21 W.Va.115, 45 Am.Rep.555.", (Bouvier's, Volume 2, Page 1763), is resolved by Article VI, which defines exactly who is subject to the jurisdiction of the constitution, and exactly who shall be contractually bound by oath or affirmation to support such constitution in consideration for Offices of Public Trust and those benefits of public service and public employment. "... The Senators and Representative before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executives and judicial

Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; ..."

The intent of Article VI is to define exactly to whom the constitutional jurisdiction applies. The fact exists that THE PEOPLE are excluded from the requirements of Article VI, *prima facie*. See: INCLUSIO UNIS EST EXCLUSIO ALTERIUS: Black's, Page 687;

No presumption that THE PEOPLE are subject to the jurisdiction of the constitution is, or can be made, since all constitutions are considered in pari materia with all other constitutions;

All constitutions are subject to the provisions of Article VI. No constitution operates on THE PEOPLE at-large by virtue of the fact that THE PEOPLE are excluded from the requirements of Article VI, et seq. In pursuing his occupation of Common Right, the individual has made no oath or affirmation supporting any constitution, and he is not subject to any constitutional jurisdictions.

## CONCLUSION - SUMMARY

If the individual is not subject to any constitutional jurisdictions, he is also not subject to any enactment made by any constitutionally created legislature.

If he is not subject to any constitutional jurisdictions, he is also not subject to any jurisdiction presumed by any constitutionally created executive branch of government.

If he is not subject to any constitutional jurisdictions, he is also not subject to any jurisdiction presumed by any constitutionally created judiciary.

In the complete absence of any lawful and verified oath or affirmation made by a nonparticipant individual to support any constitution, or in the complete absence of proving a higher title to that property known and described as the nonparticipant individual himself, *in personam* jurisdiction does not exist. In the complete absence of proving a lawful and voluntary contract made by such nonparticipant, pledging himself and/or his property rights to certain specified performance, subject matter jurisdiction does not exist. In the complete absence of any lawful and verified complaint made against such nonparticipant, wherein a real injured party claims a damage, no criminal jurisdictions exist. Thus, in the complete absence of proving the existence of either *in personam* and or subject matter jurisdiction, governmental jurisdiction over the nonparticipant individual does not exist. QUOD ERAT DEMONSTRANDUM.

## TORT REMEDY

Every act perpetrated by any constitutionally created branch of government while absent jurisdiction; every such act being required to be made unlawfully under forces of arms;

and every such act having been made without probable cause; then, every such act is required to have been made as a trespass, and/or other tort upon a nonparticipant individual, and shall constitute a case to be pursued against the perpetrator in an action at law for the recovery of damages.

## BACKGROUND

THE PEOPLE are the lawful heirs to Hereditaments, both corporeal and incorporeal, by Hereditary Succession, inclusive of the highest titles to those individual properties known and described as THE PEOPLE themselves, sui juris.

Likewise, the fact that THE PEOPLE physically exist as human life forms, clearly establishes their rights to live, their self-rights of TITLE-TO-SELF, and their rights to defend their lives which began, existed, and successfully operated through their individual genetic lineages and heritages, wherein all such rights have existed long antecedent to the formation of any constitution; consequently, THE PEOPLE are required to make NO CLAIMS for any so-called "rights" that might have been accidentally enumerated or stipulated to in the text(s) of any such instrument.

As instruments, mankind created constitutions, or social contracts or compacts, thereby created governments. See "Social Contracts or Compacts", Black's 5th, Page 1246.

PLEASE NOTICE that NO constitution ever provided THE PEOPLE with rights that they did not already possess prior to creation of such instrument.

Existence and formal recognition of preexistent rights is demonstrated throughout The Magna Carta, June 15, 1215, the Declaration of Rights in Congress, at New York, October 19, 1765, the Declaration of Rights in Congress, at Philadelphia, October 14, 1774, the Declaration of Independence July 4, 1776, the Articles of Confederation, November 15, 1777, and the Bill of Rights inclusive of the Ninth and Tenth Article Amendments, December 15, 1791, etc.

PLEASE NOTICE that throughout all of the aforementioned instruments, it cannot be proved that THE PEOPLE are subservient to any conditions of any such instruments, nor to any conditions set forth or decreed by any pseudo sovereign.

By the conspicuous absence of Declarations of Subservience, it must be presumed that the colonists did not want to forfeit their rights to any sovereign. Thus, those so called "rights" that were enumerated or stipulated to in the texts of their instruments, are in fact, a series of stringent power limitations that operate NOT upon THE PEOPLE, but upon their governments, so as to hopefully eliminate their traditionally lawless, inherently sleezoid, criminal activities. See the Declaration of Independence as the Colonists' Criminal Indictment against George III.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that no legislature has ever made ANY lawful act that operates directly on THE PEOPLE at large, simply because they do not have the power to make such an act. See Article I., Section 8.

The constitution itself is recognized amongst the Laws of Nations. as a Common Law Charter providing, in part, for the admittance of Admiralty Jurisdiction onto the land pursuant to the Law Merchant (Black's 5th, page 798) within those geographic limits set forth in Article I., Section 8, Clause 17.

Contracts made pursuant to such constitution operate in pari materia with other Commercial or Mercantile statutes emanating from the Roman Civil Jurisdictions, which are exercised under Admiralty Jurisdiction in LondonTown proper and in Washington, D.C., etc., where such contracts are generally identified or recognized throughout the world under the Laws of Nations (Black's 5th, page 733), as having been conducted under Flag Law. See "Flag Law", Black's 5th, page 574. See "Law of Nations" and "Captures on Land", Article I., Section 8, Clauses 10 and 11, respectively. See "State Names, Flags, Seals, Songs, Birds, Flowers, and Other Symbols" by George Earl Shankle, Pf.D., New York, The H. W. Wilson Company, 1941(?). See Flag Circular, War Department, The Adjutant General's Office (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1925) page 1. See "Army Regulations Number 260-10, Flags, Colors, Standards, and Guidons, by Order of the Secretary of War (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1926) pages 4 and 5.

Article III., Section 1 provides that "The Judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." Article I., Section 8, Clause 9 provides that "The Congress shall have Power To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme court;" and all such Article I courts operate solidly within the admiralty Jurisdiction, since the Congress and the United States Itself so operates.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that "The judicial Power of the United States, ..." formed in the admiralty Jurisdiction , is what is being discussed in THIS portion of the constitution.

Article III., Section 2 provides that the judicial power shall extend to all cases, in Law and Equity, arising under the constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority. Thus the judicial power extends:

- to all cases, affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls;
- to all cases, of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction;
- to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;
- to all controversies between two or more states;
- to controversies between a state and citizens of another state;
- to controversies between citizens of different states;
- to controversies between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants of different states;

- to cases between a state, or the citizens thereof, and a foreign thereof, and foreign states, citizens, or subjects .

Only in cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be a party, does the Supreme Court have original jurisdiction. In all other cases, the Supreme Court has appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is subservient to the legislative branch because Article III, Section 2 states that "... the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction ... under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.", (pursuant to Article I., Section 8, Clause 9); therefore, ALL APPEALS ARE APPEALS-IN EQUITY, MADE WITHIN THE ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION.

Each constitution FOR each of the several states of the American Union, embraces the Constitution FOR the United States of America; thus, each State government is established in admiralty to regulate commerce.

Clearly then, whether brought in a State, or in a United States' court, ANY "appeal" as to law or fact filed in ANY "appellate" court, is being brought in the admiralty jurisdiction because an "appeal" in the technical sense, was unknown to the Common Law, and it is the name of proceedings for the review of cases in equity, and in the ecclesiastical and admiralty courts. See HANDBOOK OF COMMON-LAW PLEADING (Hornbook Series) by Benjamin J. Shipman, First Copyright 1894, Last Copyright 1923, Sections 337-338, page 537.

Then At-Law, the analog of an "equity appeal" is the trial de novo based on filing the Writ-of-Error. See "trial" Black's 5th, page 1348. See "writs" Black's 5th, page 1441.

Philosophically, the differences between Law and Equity are precisely those between deductive and inductive thinking. Deductive reasoning looks backwards, examining the general facts leading to a specific set of conclusions; whereas, inductive reasoning looks in basing its general presumption on a selected set of few specific facts, upon which it derives its general conclusion, leading to equitable presumption and PRE-VENGE that is: a sort-of irrefutable revenge in-advance.

Article III, Section 2: "The trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; ..."

Apparently there were no plans for United States "crime" trial.

If this were true, the United States District Courts would not have territorial jurisdiction since such courts do not legally lie within the "State where the said Crimes shall have been committed;..."

Correspondingly then, the land upon which such District Courts were located, would have been PURCHASED BY the CONSENT of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, Dock-Yards, and other needful buildings, in which event, the United States should be able to produce its title to such property.

Article I., Section 8, Clause 17 provides that Congress exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such courts, presumably categorized as "needful buildings" since (some of the time) they do not actually qualify as Forts. Magazines, Arsenal, or Dock-Yards.

Article III, Section 2: "... but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed."

What provides United States' jurisdiction in admiralty? Is insurance an admiralty contract?

The fact that PROCEDURES of Law and Equity were merged in the latter 1930's, does not for a single moment imply that the statutory laws have superseded and/or replaced those bases of jurisprudence upon which are predicated, Law, Equity and all those other courts of Executive Chancery, no more than legislative enactments or Supreme Court decisions can overturn, supersede, replace, or unweave the very fabric of the Constitutional Charters AT LAW, which first created their very existence IN the ADMIRALTY jurisdiction itself.

As far as the 1938 Erie R.R. decision proclaiming that there is no longer a general federal Common Law, we present that there never was "a general federal Common Law", since the admiralty jurisdiction has never, cannot, and will never recognize the Common Law! Common Law and admiralty are equal and opposite jurisdictions.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that nowhere in the constitution is it stated that the Supreme Court has the power to interpret the very constitution that created such court itself. See "interpret" and "interpretation" Black's 5th, pages 733 and 734.

Otherwise, it is entirely conceivable for government to activate a self destruct mechanism such that the Legislative and Executive branches could amend the constitution in such a manner as to abolish the constitution itself. Thereafter, the Supreme Court, in its "interpretive" and "legislative" capacity, could uphold such act by proclaiming it as having been constitutional! Think about it. If one hires an employee under a contract of performance, can the employee unilaterally modify the said contract by arbitrarily deciding not to abide by the terms thereof? We believe not.

**JURISDICTION or WHO OWNS WHOM?**

Jurisdiction is purely and simply the authority or power to act. When one is exercising jurisdiction over one's self or over one's property or liberties, "Jurisdiction" is called "Rights" which are inclusive of those Liberties permitted within the limits of the Common-Law. "LIBERTY. Freedom from restraint. The faculty of willing, and the power of doing what has been willed, without influence from without. Natural liberty is the right which nature gives to all mankind of disposing of their persons and property after the manner they judge most consistent with their happiness, on condition of their acting within the limits of the law of nature and so as not to interfere with an equal exercise of the same rights by other men. Burlam. c. 3, Section 15; 1 Bla, Com. 125. It is called by Lieber social liberty, and is defined as the protection or unrestrained action in as high a degree as the claim of protection of each individual admits of. Personal liberty consists in the power of locomotion, of changing situation, of removing one's person to whatever place one's inclination may direct, without imprisonment or restraint unless by due course of law. 1 Bla. Com. 134; Hare, Const. L. 777."; Bouvier's Volume 2, Page 1964 *et seq.*

When one is exercising Jurisdiction over another's being or over another's rights, property, or liberties, "jurisdiction" is called "powers" which INCLUDE ONLY those powers permitted within the limits of a voluntary contractual agreement, or by the results of a Common- Law Suit. See include" Black's 5th, page 687.

Otherwise, jurisdiction can be lawfully acquired ONLY by permission of he who has it, and it can ONLY be enforced by forces of arms resulting in either the retention of, or the forfeiture of, rights as property.

Since all of man has rights, and since rights ABSOLUTELY cannot conflict, man has established courts to settle differences between men who would claim the same rights at the same time. Such courts theoretically avoiding some needless bloodshed in man's trials-of rights by battle.

To function as such, courts require jurisdiction in the manner of authority or power to act, and such jurisdiction is properly divided into three distinct classifications:

1. In Personam
2. Subject-Matter
3. Territorial (venue), all of which are required to be proved by the Movant prior to proceeding in any suit, inclusive of any criminal suit brought by and under any police state powers.

**JURISDICTION**

"The word is a term of large and comprehensive import, and embraces every kind of judicial action. ... It is the authority by which courts and judicial officers take cognizance of and decide case. ... The legal right by which judges exercise their authority. ... It exist when court has cognizance of class of cases involved, proper parties are present, and point to be decided is within powers of court. ... power and authority of a court to hear

and determine a judicial proceeding. ... The right and power of a court to adjudicate concerning the subject matter of a given case." Black's 5th, page 766.

Notice the words: "authority", "legal right", "powers" of court, "power" and "authority" of a court, "right" and "power" of a court ... .

Rights and Powers are Property, and like water, "authority", "legal right", and "power", must flow from a Higher Source to a lower recipient. Put another way: "Authority", "legal right", and "power" and all other Property is required to be Lawfully transferred from an Owner (Donor) to a lower recipient (Donee). See Black's 5th, page 439.

Whom do you suppose provides the "authority", "legal right", and "power" to a court? The non-existent SOVEREIGN that is prohibited by Article I, Section 9, Clause 8 and Article I., Section 10, Clause 1, or the Party to a "suit of the King's peace" (Black's, page 1286) in the manner of form of a criminal Action? CRIMINAL ACTION. "Proceeding by which person charged with a crime is brought to trial and either found not guilt or guilty and sentenced. An action, suit, or cause instituted to punish an infraction of the criminal laws." Black's 5th, page 336.

The transfer of Jurisdiction ("authority", "legal right", "power") is based on the events surrounding One's appearance in ANY court action. APPEARANCE. "A coming into court by a party to a suit, either in person or by attorney, whether as plaintiff or defendant. The formal proceeding by which a defendant submits himself to the Jurisdiction of the court. The voluntary submission to a court's Jurisdiction." Black's page 89.

## ATTORNEY AND CLIENT

"His first duty is to the courts and the public, not to the client. And where ever the duties of his client conflict with those, he owes as an officer of the court in the administration of Justice, the former must yield to the latter." Corpus Juris Secundum Vol. 7, Section 4.

## IN THE GENERAL JURISDICTION

Thus if one makes a general appearance in an action, it is presumed that he has voluntarily appeared to confer general jurisdiction on to a court; that is: full and complete jurisdiction is presumed to have voluntarily conferred onto the judge to act in the capacity of a proper (statutory) judicial officer.

Under General Jurisdiction, if the Movant in a given Action happens to be some division of the Executive Branch of Government, DMV or IRS for instance, and if on Its Own Motion, A Court decides to proceed against a Nonparticipant Individual, by presumption of Jurisdiction while absent any actual presentation of proof of Jurisdiction by the Movant, then during the period of time that the court acts and answers for the Movant (Prosecutor), Who would be Acting for The Court, since the tribunal would be standing Legally Vacant?

If One were to argue that the Article III prohibition against diminishing the Judges' Compensation, operates upon United States' Judges of those inferior Courts (Article I., Section 8, Clause 9), which the Congress has from time to time ordained and established; and that Such prohibition DOES NOT attach to Judges on the States' Levels; then Such argument remains to defy the Separation of Powers Doctrine which is applicable on ALL Levels and which thereby demands an Independent Judiciary extending to all Cases, in Law and Equity, regardless.

Just as those Cases brought in the Common-Law Jurisdiction require the Independent Jury Of-One's-Peers, those Commercial (Equity-Contract) Cases brought in the admiralty Jurisdiction pursuant to Enactments and Contracts or Maritime Claims respectively, require the Independent Judiciary Such that It is free from Executive, Legislative, and all other external forces, influences, and imminent manipulations.

Assuming for the argument, that a court of general jurisdiction has been convened within the district wherein the "crime" shall have been committed, thus satisfying territorial requirements; and assuming that the nonparticipant individual, is physically under the state's arrest, custody, and control (not necessarily Lawfully), thereby presumably satisfying In Personam Jurisdictional requirements by forces of arms; then there still remains subject-matter jurisdiction to be proved by the Movant.

Exactly what Insurable Interest does the Movant (plaintiff) have in a nonparticipant individual's property, such as could cause attachment of subject matter jurisdiction over such property? See Insurable Interest". Black's 5th, Page 720.

If one uses one's own time and energy (Property in the form of one's nonrenewable resource), to work as a common-right matter in exchange for payment (Property in Value of Exchange); and if one uses such property in value of exchange to buy, say, an automobile (Property), how does Washington , for instance, obtain a legal interest in the said automobile, sufficient that it can regulate, tax, control, and prohibit the nonparticipant individual's free use of his own(ed) private property?

**PROPERTY**

"That which is peculiar or proper to any person; that which belongs exclusively to one; in the strict legal sense, an aggregate of rights which are guaranteed and protected by the government.

- The term is said to extend to every species of valuable right and interest.
- More specifically, ownership; the unrestricted and exclusive right to a thing; the right to dispose of a thing in every legal way, to possess it, to use it, and to exclude every one else from interfering with it.
- That dominion or indefinite right of use or disposition which one may lawfully exercise over particular things or subjects.
- The exclusive right of possessing, enjoying, and disposing of a thing.

- The highest right a man can have to anything; being used for that right which one has to lands or tenements, goods or chattels, which no way depends on another man's courtesy.
- The word is also commonly used to denote everything which is the subject of ownership, corporeal or incorporeal, tangible or intangible, visible or invisible, real or personal; everything that has an exchangeable value or which goes to makeup wealth or estate. It extends to every species of valuable right and interest, and includes real and personal property, easements, franchises, and incorporeal hereitaments.

"Black's Law Dictionary, Revised 4th Edition, page 1382.

From the above definition of "Property", it would appear that Washington has somehow managed to become the legal owner of the nonparticipant individual's property .

How then, did Washington obtain title to the said private property?

If Washington Incorporated were to claim title to the public rights of way. Such rights of way would have become private privileges of way.

The facts remain that these properties have either originated as private toll roads or as highways in the public domain long antecedent to the formation of Washington itself.

How then did Washington obtain titles to the said private and public properties?

Now if it were presumed that a "crime" were committed, who and where is the victim, damaged party, or real and actual party-of-interest?

If it is presumed that Washington , in its corporate capacity, were somehow damaged by way of some non-participant individual's non-adherence to selected legislative enactments, how then was Washington incorporated actually damaged and to what extent?

If it were presumed that an action be brought in the name of the "injured" people of Washington , such action would inevitably require that:

1. the attorney General produce the actual and verifiable, written, Powers-of-Attorney authorizing Him to represent EACH of ALL of the People of the State of Washington in His Mass-Action Criminal Law Suit;
2. The Nonparticipant Individual has injured EACH of ALL of the People of the State of Washington , otherwise there could be no Cause Of Action;
3. the Attorney General can produce Actual and Verified Complaints made by EACH of ALL of the People of the State of Washington ; and
4. the attorney general disclose the proposed source of Jurors if the matter were to go to trail before an "impartial" jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed; in light of the fact that EACH of ALL of the State of Washington would have

by then become Parties-Of-Interest to the outcome of Such Legal Mass-Action therefore EACH of ALL of the People of the State of Washington could no longer qualify as "impartial".

From where then, would an Impartial Jury be drawn?

THIS IS WHY One is REQUIRED to volunteer into a GENERAL Jurisdiction.

The foregoing can occur only under private contract-law exclusively within the admiralty Jurisdiction as defined in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 otherwise the separation of powers doctrines forbid general application of these anomalies.

From the foregoing it is plainly evident that governments have no Jurisdiction over THE PEOPLE since THE PEOPLE cannot be proved to be subject to the Jurisdiction created by Their own Constitution Charters, and those presumptions that EVERY HUMAN BEING in this Nation is subject to Enactments of the Legislature is rebuttable. See Black's Page 1067.

Memorandum of Principle is a short form or outline of issues in this instant matter from the beginning. This form, the memorandum is a law tool and an education tool. This set of documents, Memorandum of Principle, Memorandum of Code and Law, and Subject Matter Memorandum are available on the world wide web at http://www.adja.com. The World Wide Web is duly noticed to all recipients as a common law publish by Charles C., Miller of the events and activities surrounding this matter CR97-51C instrument of indictment. Said notice of publish must be rebutted within 30 days as posted by any party having variance against statements contained within these documents as posted or published on the "web". Common Law is the law of the people and the law they live by. In times past the publish has been honored as the preferred form of notification either by crier, published post, or newspaper. The world wide web is simply the latest form of notice and publish. Therefore. common law of the web is established by it's users as in the past and is now the highest and most effect form of notice and publish within each venue and jurisdiction.

The United States Codes, being unclear at times and inimical of the Statutes at times, are hereby agreed to be useful only as finding aids to the laws located within the Statutes at Large. These are the words of the lawmakers, and are reliable evidence of the law. The intent of Congress and legislative history are the essential elements of the spirit of the law, without which the law becomes mere words. No statute shall be considered without reference to its historical context, its legislative history and the intent of Congress.

Likewise, the Code of Federal Regulations. There is no law of general applicability without an implementing regulation, and that regulation is found in the Federal Register. Implementing Regulations guide the conduct of the agencies in the administration of the law. To the Agencies, the Regulations are law that act upon them, just as the law they administer acts upon others. The CFR was devised as a finding aid to the complete

Regulations, located in the Federal Register... Just as the United States Codes are useful as a finding aid, so the CFR is a useful finding aid to the Regulations. Codes are neither law nor regulation. However, without a regulation published in the Federal Register, the Agency is powerless to act upon the law. Any law, to be enforceable, must have administrative enforcement provisions published within the many pages of the Federal Register.

Parties herein will limit their material evidence to the Statutes At Large, the Regulations from the Federal Register, and this case records, along with supporting documentation of the foregoing. The scope of the conference and attendant decisions and actions will be limited to and/or based upon the law and its implementing regulations and the record. All parties agree to hew to the law, since it is the law itself and its application that is here at issue.

Charles C., Miller, accused reminds this court of its duty and requests discharge of CR97-51C instrument of indictment immediately.

Submitted by:

Charles C., Miller

REFERENCES

Black's Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition. (Hereinafter: Black's, Page _____.)

Bouvier's Law Dictionary and Concise Encyclopedia, Third revision (Eighth Edition) 1914, ISBN 0-8994-335-8, (Hereinafter: Bouvier's Volume _____, Page _____.)

Constitution FOR the United States of America (hereinafter: by Article or Amendment), in pari materia with the Washington Constitution pursuant to Article III, Section 1 thereof.

The Supreme Court on ABROGATION OF RIGHTS: Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966).

The Supreme Court on COMMON-LAW PLEA TO JURISDICTION: Roberts v. Lewis, 144 U.S. 653:

The Supreme Court on the COURTS OF STAR CHAMBER: Faretta v. Washington, 422 U.S. 806

The Supreme Court on JURISDICTION: Maxfield's Lessee v. Levy, 4 U.S. 308, 311, 312 (1797).

The Supreme Court on RIGHTS OF CONTRACT: Hale v. Henkel, 20 U.S. 43, 74-75 (1906)